

## **Historic Resources Commission Meeting Minutes of June 8, 2011**

**Members Present:** Capi Wampler, Diane Duermit, Nan Chase, John Dean,  
David Nutter, Joe Carney, J. Ray Elingburg, Brian Cook

**Members Absent:** Ashley Black, Jonathan Lucas, Hillary Cole

**Staff:** Stacy Merten, Jannice Ashley, Jennifer Blevins

**Public:** Bryan Moffitt, Erin Foy, Jim Slatton, Frank Hallstrom, Michael McDonough, Marion Sitton, Simonow Jackson, Jeremy McGowan, David & Teresa Gance, Cathy Jackson, Kevin Ward

**Call to Order:** Chair Duermit calls the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. with a quorum present.

**Adoption of Minutes:** Commissioner Wampler moves to adopt the May 11, 2011 minutes as written.  
Second by: Commissioner Nutter  
Vote for: All

### **Consent Agenda:**

**Owner/Applicant:** Susan Roderick  
**Subject Property:** 438 Montford Ave.  
**Hearing Date:** June 8, 2011  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9639-94-0917  
**Zoning District:** Office  
**Other Permits:** Building & Zoning

### **MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT**

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – project description; Exhibit B - (6) photographs of existing structures; Exhibit C – site location map; Exhibit D – site plan; Exhibit E – floor plan; Exhibit F (4 pages) proposed elevations; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2011, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 27<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2011, as indicated by Exhibits G and H.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.

3. That the application is to renovate existing outbuilding for a guest cottage per attached plans. New horizontal wood siding and roofing to match main structure. Replace garage doors with wood French doors, construct new main entrance on west façade and box bay window on east façade. All new windows will be wood, SDL. New entrance door will be wood and glass.
4. That the guidelines for Non-Contributing Structures found on pages 68-69 and the guidelines for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85, in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.
5. This application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
  1. The architectural integrity of the structure is maintained and the alteration is compatible with the character of the neighborhood, the building and its environment.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Wampler

Second by: Commissioner Chase

Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued, with the following conditions:**

1. Window and door specifications will be submitted to staff for approval.

Motion by: Commissioner Wampler

Second by: Commissioner Chase

Vote for: All

**Owner/Applicant:** Jim and Anne Slatton

**Subject Property:** 79 Cumberland Ave.

**Hearing Date:** June 8, 2011

**Historic District:** Montford

**PIN:** 9649-22-0315

#### **MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT**

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – (4) photographs of structure; Exhibit B – site plan; Exhibit C – foundation plans and window/door schedule; Exhibit D – (2 pages) floor plans; Exhibit E – (2 pages) existing and proposed elevation drawings; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26th day of May, 2011, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 27th day of May, 2011, as indicated by Exhibits F and G.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to add two-story addition per attached plans. Addition will be 12' 10" x 10' on first level and 18.5' x 12' 10" on 2nd level. Reuse existing historic window from 2nd level bedroom on new addition. All new windows will be double hung, wood, TDL, 8 over 1. New door will be wood with ½ glass. Shingle siding, roofing, pebbledash and all detailing to match existing original materials and finishes.
4. That the guidelines for Additions found on pages 88-89 and the guidelines for Windows and Doors found on pages 84-85, in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.
5. That this application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
  1. The addition is sited on the rear elevation where no character defining features are removed or obscured and designed to be compatible with the existing structure.
  2. Historic windows will be re-used.
  3. Non-historic incompatible windows will be replaced with more compatible units.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Wampler

Second by: Commissioner Chase

Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Wampler

Second by: Commissioner Chase

Vote for: All

## Public Hearings:

### Agenda Item

**Owner/Applicant:** Lisa Smith & James Yamada  
**Subject Property:** 162 Cumberland Ave.  
**Hearing Date:** June 8, 2011  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9649-13-2150  
**Zoning District:** RM-8  
**Other Permits:** None

<b>Staff Comments</b>	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p><b>Property Description:</b> E. L. Gaston House. Plain 2-story dwelling. Weatherboards with simple trim. Asymmetrical porch with Montford brackets, stone foundation. Built 1906 (Owner)</p> <p><b>Certificate of Appropriateness Request:</b> Construct split rail fence along west/rear property line on Cumberland Alley per attached survey. <b>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</b></p> <p><b>HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines &amp; Submittal Requirements:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Staff was reluctant to permit the fence as a minor work as split rail fencing is not specifically indicated as an acceptable material in the Montford Guidelines, however it is also not prohibited.</li></ol> <p>The guidelines for Fences found on pages 36-37, in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p><b>Staff Recommendation:</b> Staff recommends approval as proposed.</p> <p><b>Suggested Reasons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Supporting documentation indicates that split rail fencing was in use during the period of significance.</li><li>2. The fence is located in the rear yard.</li></ol>
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	

### Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

### Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioner Nutter believes the material to be appropriate for this situation and others agree.

**Commission Action**

**MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT**

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – letter to commission; Exhibit B – site plan; Exhibit C – (4) photographs of alley fencing; Exhibit D – excerpt from *Cabins and Castles*; Exhibit E – excerpt from *Historic Montford*; Exhibit F - (11) historic photographs; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2011, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 27<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2011, as indicated by Exhibits G and H.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to construct a split rail fence along west/rear property line on Cumberland Alley per attached survey.
4. That The guidelines for Fences found on pages 36-37, in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.
5. That this application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
  1. Supporting documentation indicates that split rail fencing was in use during the period of significance.
  2. The fence is located in the rear yard.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Chase

Second by: Commissioner Wampler

Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Chair Duermit

Second by: Commissioner Wampler

Vote for: All

### Agenda Item

**Owner/Applicant:** Gail Ferguson/Michael McDonough  
**Subject Property:** 320 Montford Ave.  
**Hearing Date:** June 8, 2011  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9639-94-8280  
**Zoning District:** RM-8  
**Other Permits:** Building & Zoning

<b>Staff Comments</b>	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p><b>Property Description:</b> This is a garage that was converted into an apartment in the early 1990's. The structure is located behind a late 19th early 20th century 2 1/2 story vernacular dwelling. Shingles over weatherboards, paneled porch posts, irregular roof, simple detail.</p> <p><b>Certificate of Appropriateness Request:</b> Add a 10' x 12' sunroom addition to existing structure per attached plans. Addition will have a mixed brick and stone foundation and metal roof with exposed rafter tails. Add brackets and extend roof over front entrance door. Install new screen door. <b>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</b></p> <p><b>HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines &amp; Submittal Requirements:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Materials and detailing should be compatible with main structure.</li><li>2. Window and door specifications should be submitted to staff for review and approval</li></ol> <p>The guidelines for Carriage Houses, Garages and Accessory Structures found on pages 34-35, in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p><b>Staff Recommendation:</b> Staff recommends approval with concerns as noted</p> <p><b>Suggested Reasons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The architectural integrity of the structure is maintained and the alteration is compatible with the character of the neighborhood, the building and its environment.</li></ol> <p>She clarifies that the structure is actually on Danville Place, an alley. She notes that the applicant has not specified a roof color and states that it should be a dark color.</p>
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	The applicant was not present.

### Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	

### Commission Comments/Discussion

Commissioner Cook asks for clarification on the roof material; will the metal be applied only on the addition, or on the entire roof surface? It is determined that the intent is to cover the whole roof with metal. The Commissioners agree that there are too many questions to act on this item without the presence of the applicant.

Commissioner Wampler moves to continue the hearing until the applicant arrives.

Second by: Commissioner Nutter

Vote for: All

### Agenda Item

**Owner/Applicant:** David & Teresa Gance/Jeremy McGowan  
**Subject Property:** 262 Cumberland Ave.  
**Hearing Date:** June 8, 2011  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9649-04-5008  
**Zoning District:** RS-8  
**Other Permits :** Building & Zoning

<b>Staff Comments</b>	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p><b>Property Description:</b> This is vacant lot located behind 258 Cumberland Ave.</p> <p><b>Certificate of Appropriateness Request:</b> Construct a new two-story single family structure of 2,063 sq. ft. with garage basement per attached plans. Structure will have masonry/smooth stucco foundation with stone veneer piers. Siding will be horizontal hardi-plank on first floor with wood shingles above. Roof will be 8/12 with asphalt shingle in                      Windows per drawings and specifications will be aluminum clad,                      . Front door will be wood ¾ light with transom and sidelights. Details include brackets, corner boards and 4" window and door surrounds. Driveway will be (color) gravel.</p> <p><b>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</b></p> <p><b>HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines &amp; Submittal Requirements:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Will windows be SDL/muntin pattern per drawings?</li><li>2. Roof color/sample needed</li><li>3. Material samples needed</li><li>4. Story board needed- verify street view</li><li>5. Metal doors are not allowed per the guidelines</li></ol> <p>The guidelines for New Construction: Primary Structures found on pages 92-93, the guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41, and the guidelines for Walkways, Driveways and Off-Street Parking found on pages 50-51 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.</p>
-----------------------	---

	<p><b>Staff Recommendation:</b> Staff recommends approval with concerns as noted.</p> <p><b>Suggested Reasons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The structure is compatible with the Montford historic district in terms of siting, scale, materials and detailing.</li> </ol> <p>She explains that the lot is a flag lot behind 258 Cumberland Avenue.</p>
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	<p>Jeremy McGowan, contractor, and David Gance, owner, are available for questions. They pass out copies of a revised site plan showing the house shifted 15' closer to the south property line and explain that the purpose is to save a row of basswood trees on the other side of the lot. This move will probably necessitate removal of a black oak tree. An arborist has been engaged to examine the black oak because there are signs of disease and decay.</p> <p>They confirm that the windows are simulated divided light and that they are 2 over 2, as shown in the drawings, not the specifications submitted. They will submit correct specifications to staff. The roof will be weatherwood color, GAF brand, architectural, asphalt shingles. A stone sample is displayed. The stucco will be a rough sand finish. The siding will be Hardi-plank with a 6" reveal and cedar shingles above. The desire is to show the simulated grain side of the Hardi-plank siding. The shingles will be stained with a transparent stain to retain their natural color.</p>

#### Public Comment

Speaker Name	Issue(s)
Michael McDonough, Cathy Jackson	Concerns about allowing too many synthetic materials

#### Commission Comments/Discussion

<p>Commissioner Carney explains that the Commission typically requires the smooth side of wood or Hardi-plank siding out, but recent information is that the Hardi-plank manufacturer's warranty requires the grain side facing out. Commissioner Dean believes the grain side has more character and is appropriate. The Commissioners discuss the reasons for requiring smooth siding and the implications of allowing simulated wood grain. Commissioner Carney states that there is a new product that has a slight grain with a more historic look, but the Commission has not seen a sample yet. Mr. Gance states that he would want to investigate the cost and see the material himself before committing to use it. He passes out copies of an aerial photograph and 2 street view elevation drawings to demonstrate that the house will probably not be visible from Cumberland Avenue. Ms. Merten explains that the guidelines allow for approval of new materials on a case by case basis, but there must be justification stated in the motion. After further discussion and a straw vote, Chair Duermit explains to Mr. Gance that he can request a continuance until the next meeting or amend his application to use a smooth siding so that he can move forward with the project. She notes that if the project is denied, the re-application process is more cumbersome. She states that he would also have the option of later requesting an amendment to his Certificate of Appropriateness if he finds another material he wishes to use. Mr. Gance asks to amend his application to use a smooth sided Hardi product and also to use a wood door for the basement.</p> <p>Commissioner Chase asks if he will substitute an heirloom rose for the double knockout rose shown on his landscape plan and he agrees. He also agrees that he will use dark gray gravel for</p>
---



the driveway. Commissioner Wampler asks for a copy of the arborist's report on the black oak tree to be submitted to staff for the record.

### **Commission Action**

#### **MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT**

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – new construction checklist; Exhibit B – (lot 2 )elevation; Exhibit C – aerial parcel map; Exhibit D - street view; Exhibit E – (3 pages )landscape plan key; Exhibit F (2 pages) site plan; Exhibit G – (3 pages) elevations; Exhibit H – (2 pages) floor plans; Exhibit I – (14 pages) window and door specifications ; Exhibit J – revised site plan; Exhibit K – stone sample; Exhibit L – 2 street view elevations; Exhibit M – roof color sample; and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2011, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 27<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2011, as indicated by Exhibits N and O.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to construct a new two-story single family structure of 2,063 sq. ft. with basement garage per attached plans. Structure will have masonry/sand finish stucco foundation with stone veneer piers. Siding will be horizontal, smooth hardi-plank on first floor with wood shingles above. Roof will be 8/12 with GAF brand, weatherwood color, architectural asphalt shingles. Windows per drawings and specifications will be aluminum clad, 2 over 2, SDL. Front door will be wood ¾ light with transom and sidelights. Details include brackets, corner boards and 4" window and door surrounds. Driveway will be dark gray gravel. Landscaping per attached plans.
4. That the guidelines for New Construction: Primary Structures found on pages 92-93, the guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41, and the guidelines for Walkways, Driveways and Off-Street Parking found on pages 50-51 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.
5. That this application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
  1. The structure is compatible with the Montford historic district in terms of siting, scale, materials and detailing.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Wampler

Second by: Commissioner Nutter

Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued, with the following conditions:**

- 1. Revised window specifications will be submitted to staff for approval**
- 2. Landscape plan will be revised to show heirloom roses instead of double knockout roses**
- 3. Arborist's report on black oak tree will be submitted to staff for the record**
- 4. The basement door will be wood**
- 5. A sample of the Hardi-plank siding material will be submitted to staff for approval**

Motion by: Commissioner Wampler

Second by: Commissioner Nutter

Vote for: All

Chair Duermit reopened the hearing for 320 Montford Avenue.

#### **Commission Comments/Discussion**

Michael McDonough, project architect, describes the metal roof and says the owner would like to use a bronze or dark red color. He describes the stone and the tumbled brick planned for the foundation. Ms. Merten advises the Commissioners that they can approve the metal roof if they think it is compatible with the asphalt shingles on the main house and says that metal roofing is permitted on new structures. She also notes that the subject accessory structure has been substantially altered over the years. Commissioner Nutter states that Danville Place is more prominent than an alley. It is also noted that the subject structure is more substantial than a typical accessory structure. Ms. Merten states that if it were a main house, proof of an original metal roof would be required to allow covering or replacing the asphalt shingles with metal. It is noted that the structure already has two roofing materials and that it is not located especially close to the main structure. A straw vote indicates that five of the eight Commissioners present would approve the metal roof to replace the existing asphalt shingles.

Mr. McDonough asks if he can use metal clad windows because they are permitted on new construction. Ms. Merten reads from the guidelines to clarify that metal clad windows are *not* permitted on additions and Commissioner Wampler states that it has already been established that the subject structure was built in the same time period as the main house.

#### **Commission Action**

##### **MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT**

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – (1) photograph of structure; Exhibit B – site plan; Exhibit C – (2 pages) elevations and wall section; Exhibit D – floor plans; and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members except Commissioner Carney;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2011, and that each owner of real property situated within

two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 27th day of May, 2011, as indicated by Exhibits E and F.

2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to add a 10' x 12' sunroom addition to existing structure per attached plans. Addition will have a mixed brick and stone foundation and metal roof with exposed rafter tails. Add brackets and extend roof over front entrance door. Install new screen door. New windows will be wood.
4. That the guidelines for Carriage Houses, Garages and Accessory Structures found on pages 34-35, in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.
5. That this application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
  1. The architectural integrity of the structure is maintained and the alteration is compatible with the character of the neighborhood, the building and its environment.
  2. Metal roofing is a traditional historic material and the color will blend with the main structure.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Chase

Vote for: Commissioners Nutter, Chase, Cook, Elingburg, Dean and Carney

Vote against: Chair Duermit and Commissioner Wampler

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued, with the following conditions:**

- 1. The roofing material will be dark in color and a sample will be submitted to staff for approval.**
- 2. Window and door specifications will be submitted to staff for approval.**
- 3. Brick and stone samples will be submitted to staff for approval.**

Motion by: Commissioner Nutter

Second by: Commissioner Chase

Vote for: Commissioners Nutter, Chase, Cook, Elingburg, Dean and Carney

Vote against: Chair Duermit and Commissioner Wampler

---

### Agenda Item

**Owner/Applicant:** Lewis and Susan Rothlein/Kevin Ward/Southeast Ecological Design  
**Subject Property:** 299 Montford Ave.

**Hearing Date:** June 8, 2011  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9649-04-2138  
**Zoning District:** RM-8  
**Other Permits :** Building & Zoning

<b>Staff Comments</b>	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p><b>Property Description:</b> This is a vacant lot located to the north of 291 Montford Ave.</p> <p><b>Certificate of Appropriateness Request:</b> Construct new 2-story single family structure per attached plans. New structure will have a 1300 sq. ft. foot print and 880 sq. ft. 2<sup>nd</sup> story with wrap around front porch, partial basement and attached garage. Structure will have a framed concrete block foundation with dashed stucco and stone finish in front, wood shingle siding and composition asphalt shingle roof. Roof will be 6/12 with 5/12 over porch. Windows will be per drawings and double hung, SDL, aluminum clad. Details include front elevation eyebrows, cornices moldings, window and door surrounds. Driveway will be gravel(color?) Grading and tree removal per attached grading plan. Landscaping per attached plans. Ground cover must be established within 15 days of completion of construction with remainder installed within 3 years. (See guidelines for minimum plant size.) <b>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</b></p> <p><b>HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines &amp; Submittal Requirements:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Garage Doors are not appropriate for Montford.</li><li>2. Window, door, garage door and solar panel specifications, material samples and story board should be submitted for final review.</li><li>3. Retaining wall details are required.</li></ol> <p>The Guidelines for New Construction: Primary Structures found on pages 92-93 and the Guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41, in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p><b>Staff Recommendation:</b> Staff recommends approval with concerns as noted.</p> <p><b>Suggested Reasons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The structure is compatible with the Montford historic district in terms of siting, scale, materials and detailing.</li></ol>
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	Kevin Ward, project contractor, is available for questions. He passes out revised floor plans and elevations and states that the garage doors will be wood instead of metal.

**Public Comment**

<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	

### **Commission Comments/Discussion**

Commissioner Chase asks about the policy on frosted glass. Ms. Merten responds that it is not prohibited. She says the applicant must specify the materials to be used, but may request an amendment at a later date, which could be approved at a staff level. Commissioner Cook asks for clarification on the positioning of the solar panels on the deck. Mr. Ward responds that they will be flat panels, mounted at a 45 degree angle and will be visible above the deck railing by about 5 feet. Ms. Merten notes the requirement for solar panels to be mounted as flush as possible and not extend beyond the roof ridge. The Commissioners discuss how to treat panels not mounted on a roof. Commissioner Cook displays a sketch and Mr. Ward agrees it accurately reflects the probable appearance. He clarifies that the panels will be visible from the unopened alley, but not from Montford Avenue. Possible screening materials and techniques are discussed and the Commissioners agree that the panels need not be hidden from view, but they should be as inconspicuous as possible. They suggest raising the height of the deck railing to 42 inches and using three 6' panels instead of two 10' panels.

Mr. Ward displays a photograph of the proposed stone and a discussion on the stone size and placement follows. The Commissioners agree that the stone sizes should not vary so greatly and the look should be less rustic than the photograph shown. Mr. Ward displays a storyboard, roof shingle sample, wood shingle siding sample, window trim, aluminum cladding, stucco color and finish. He asks to amend his application to use rough sand finished stucco.

### **Commission Action**

#### **MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT**

Madam Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – new construction checklist; Exhibit B – topographic cross section; Exhibit C – site plan; Exhibit D basement plan; Exhibit E – floor plan; Exhibit F (2 pages) elevations; Exhibit G – landscape plan; Exhibit H – revised elevation drawings; Exhibit I – storyboard; Exhibit J – photograph of stone; Exhibit K – window trim and siding sample; Exhibit L – stucco sample; Exhibit M – roof shingle sample; and the Commission's actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 26<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2011, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 27<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2011, as indicated by Exhibits N and O.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. That the application is to construct new 2-story single family structure per attached plans. New structure will have a 1300 sq. ft. footprint and 880 sq. ft. 2<sup>nd</sup> story with wrap around front porch, partial basement and attached garage. Structure will have a framed concrete block foundation with sanded stucco and stone finish in front, wood shingle siding and composition asphalt, architectural shingle, weatherwood color roof. Roof will be 6/12 with 5/12 over porch. Windows will be per drawings and double hung, SDL, aluminum clad.

Details include front elevation eyebrows, cornices, moldings, window and door surrounds. Driveway will be gray gravel. Grading and tree removal per attached grading plan. Landscaping per attached plans. Ground cover must be established within 15 days of completion of construction with remainder installed within 3 years. (See guidelines for minimum plant size.)

4. That the guidelines for New Construction: Primary Structures found on pages 92-93, the guidelines for Landscaping and Trees found on pages 40-41, the guidelines for Walkways, Driveways and Off-Street Parking found on pages 50-51 and the guidelines for Sustainability and Emerging Technology found on pages 80-81 in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.
5. That this application does meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
  1. The structure is compatible with the Montford Historic District in terms of siting, scale, materials and detailing.
  2. The solar panels for this structure will be located as inconspicuously as possible with appropriate screening as available.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness are compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Wampler

Second by: Commissioner Nutter

Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued, with the following conditions:**

- 1. The final size and placement of the solar panels will be approved by staff**
- 2. The size and placement of the stone foundation material will be approved by staff**

Motion by: Commissioner Wampler

Second by: Commissioner Chase

Vote for: All

### Agenda Item

**Owner/Applicant:** Marion D. Sitton  
**Subject Property:** 43 Pearson Dr.  
**Hearing Date:** June 8, 2011  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9649-02-6714  
**Zoning District:** RM-8  
**Other Permits:** Building & Zoning

<b>Staff Comments</b>	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the subject property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p><b>Property Description:</b> This is a house constructed by Neighborhood Housing Services in mid 1990's.</p> <p><b>Certificate of Appropriateness Request:</b> Construct a vinyl fence in the front yard per attached plans. <b>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</b></p> <p><b>HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines &amp; Submittal Requirements:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is not appropriate to introduce vinyl or plastic fencing in a front yard.</li> </ol> <p>The guidelines for Fences found on pages 36-37, in the Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District, adopted on April 14, 2010, were used to evaluate this request.</p> <p><b>Staff Recommendation:</b> Staff recommends against approval for the following reasons</p> <p><b>Suggested Reasons:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is not appropriate to introduce vinyl or plastic fencing in a front yard.</li> </ol>
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	<p>Marion Sitton is available for questions. She states that she purchased the house from Neighborhood Housing Services and was not made aware of the requirement for a Certificate of Appropriateness or the prohibition on vinyl fencing. She states that she needs the fence for the safety of her grandchildren and that she saved her money for three years in order to afford the purchase. She had asked previously and learned that she could not install a chain link fence, but she looked around the neighborhood and saw white fences and other types of fencing, so assumed her white fence would be allowed. She states that she has contacted the retailer who sold her the fence and they will not refund her money.</p>

**Public Comment**

<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	

**Commission Comments/Discussion**

<p>Commissioner Chase asks if a wooden fence could have been approved. Ms. Merten responds that a wood fence in a front yard would be reviewed as a major work and the Commissioners would evaluate each request individually. Commissioner Chase points out that there are unsightly wooden and chain link fences in the immediate area and Ms. Merten responds that they were installed prior to the historic district designation. Chair Duermit suggests the possibility that Neighborhood Housing or Habitat could sell the fence or use it in another location and replace it with an appropriate fence. Ms. Merten clarifies with Ms. Sitton that the posts of the fence are set in concrete. She says that the City of Asheville Community Development Division might have funding available to help with the replacement. Commissioner Wampler suggests that a subcommittee of Commissioners volunteer to try to find options for Ms. Sitton to sell the fence</p>
---

and find an appropriate replacement and Ms. Sitton agrees. The Commissioners agree to form the committee, to meet prior to the August, 2011 regular Commission meeting and to have a solution by January, 2012. Commissioners Chase, Wampler, Elingburg, Dean and Carney volunteer to serve on the committee.

### Commission Action

Commissioner Nutter moves to continue the hearing until the January 11, 2012 meeting.

Second by: Commissioner Wampler

Vote for: All

### Preliminary Review:

**Owner/Applicant:** John and Janis Bell/Bryan Moffitt  
**Subject Property:** 9 Kitchen Place  
**Hearing Date:** June 8, 2011  
**Historic District:** Biltmore Village  
**PIN:** 9647-69-7848  
**Zoning District:** CB-II/Commercial Core  
**Other Permits:** Building & Zoning

<b>Staff Comments</b>	<p>Ms. Merten shows slides of the property and reviews the following staff report.</p> <p><b>Property Description:</b> Mid 20<sup>th</sup> century 2-story brick commercial structure considered to be neutral with respect to the historic district.</p> <p><b>Certificate of Appropriateness Request:</b> Renovate rear façade per attached plans to include demolition of non-historic exterior rear stairs and construction of addition to house new stairs. Install new entrance door. New door will be . New windows will be Create openings in brick for new windows on south façade. New windows will be Trim color will be</p> <p><b>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</b></p> <p><b>HRC Staff Concerns per the Applicable Guidelines &amp; Submittal Requirements:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Window and door specifications should be provided</li><li>2. Consider a more vertical alignment for new windows on south elevation</li></ol> <p>The Guidelines for Rehab of “Commercial Type” buildings found in Chapter 3, Book 2 - <i>Design Guidelines for the Rehabilitation of Existing Buildings in Biltmore Village</i> were used to evaluate this request.</p>
<b>Applicant(s)</b>	<p>Bryan Moffitt, project architect, is available for questions. He explains the purpose of the project and the layout of the building. He explains the possibility of new door openings, depending on how the plans progress and on the results of the property boundary survey. He notes that the zoning ordinance requires additional parking due to the change of use. He states that his client wants to improve functionality and also improve the look of the rear of the structure. He displays a brick sample that may be used in</p>



	the project.
--	--------------

**Commission Comments/Discussion**

Commissioner Nutter states that the structure is so prominent that the rear should be reviewed as if it were a front. He asks about future plans for the surrounding parcels. Mr. Moffitt states that his client does not own those properties. The Commissioners ask Mr. Moffitt to try to design the proposed window openings in a more vertical than horizontal manner and to consider the massing of the structure when moving forward with the plans.

**Other Business:**

Ms. Merten notes that the recent Court of Appeals case sent to the Commissioners serves as a reminder that their decisions should always be based on the guidelines and evidence given at the hearings, not on personal opinion.

Commissioner Wampler moves to adjourn the meeting.

Second by: Commissioner Dean

Vote for: All

The meeting is adjourned at 7:15 p.m.